

- (correction of MORPHITES) Newman, E., 1834 (*Ent. Mag.* vol. 2(4), pp. 379, 381) for the present name MORPHIDAE Westwood, [1851] (and its reference); with type-genus unaltered;
- (2) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* the family-group names –
- (a) MORPHITES Newman, E., 1834 (*Ent. Mag.* vol. 2, pp. 379, 381), an incorrect original spelling of MORPHIDAE;
- (b) MORPHOIDES Agassiz, 1847 (*Nomencl. zool., Index univ.*, 4<sup>o</sup> edn., p. 239, an unjustified emendation of MORPHIDES Boisduval, 1836, itself an incorrect subsequent spelling of MORPHIDAE).

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF EDWARDSIIDAE  
ANDRES, 1881 (COELENTERATA: ACTINARIA). Z.N.(S.)2261  
(see vol. 36: 175–179)

By R. K. Brooke (*FitzPatrick Institute, University of Cape Town,  
Rondebosch 7700, R.S.A.*) and  
Prof. J.H. Day (*47 Liesbeek Rd., Rosebank 7700, R.S.A.*)

While Dr Williams has made a very good case which we support for the conservation of *Edwardsia* de Quatrefages, 1841, he has given no reasons for his request that the International Commission place the family-group name EDWARDSIIDAE Andres, 1881, on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology. If the Commission decides to comply with his request to conserve *Edwardsia* as we hope it will, EDWARDSIIDAE is adequately protected unless there is some problem to which Dr Williams has not drawn attention. The Commission should not be asked to do nor should it do anything more than is needed to solve the problem placed before it.

Reply to the Comment of R.K. Brooke & J.H. Day on Z.N.(S.)2261

By R.B. Williams (*2 Carrington Place, Tring, Herts. HP23 5LA*)

Brooke & Day have questioned the need to request the Commission to place the name EDWARDSIIDAE Andres, 1881 on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology. I am not aware of any problem connected with this name beyond that which I have already stated (Williams, 1979).

2. At the time of writing, the two problems of homonymy of the genus name *Edwardsia* and the invalidity of the family name EDWARDSIIDAE remain separate. I accept that if *Edwardsia* Costa, 1834 were to be suppressed in favour of *Edwardsia* de Quatrefages, 1841, then EDWARDSIIDAE would be automatically validated, but if any valid objection were raised to the suppression of *Edwardsia* Costa, the application for conservation of EDWARDSIIDAE and its placing on the Official List would still have to be considered.

3. In complex cases, it is important to place before the Commission all the relevant information and alternative suggested actions which might be necessary. It is then the responsibility of the Commission alone to judge whichever of the suggested actions are most appropriate in the circumstances.

#### REFERENCES

WILLIAMS, R. B., 1979. *Edwardsia* Costa, 1834 (Arthropoda: Crustacea): proposed suppression under the plenary powers with conservation of *Edwardsia* de Quatrefages, 1841 and Edwardsiidae Andres, 1881 (Coelenterata: Actiniaria). Z.N.(S.)2261. *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36: 175-179.

#### COMMENT ON PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF NEOTYPE FOR *MUSCICAPA RUFICAUDA* SWAINSON, 1838 (AVES).

Z.N.(S.)2270

(see vol. 36, pp. 180-186)

(1) By H.E. Wolters (*Zoological Museum Alexander Koenig,  
D.5300 Bonn, B.R.D.*)

Though I dislike the growing tendency to retain names for taxa to which they were erroneously applied by most or all subsequent authors, I should agree with Mr Benson's proposal to use in future the name *Siphia ruficauda* Sharpe, 1879 for the flycatcher hitherto known as *Muscicapa* (or more correctly, as I believe, *Ficedula*) *ruficauda* Swainson, 1838 (the holotype of which is a specimen of what is generally known as *Cyornis unicolor* Blyth, 1843) were it not for the fact that, many years before Sharpe, Blyth, 1851, *J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, vol. 20, p. 523, had already proposed the name *Cyornis aequalicauda* (erroneously quoted as *Muscicapa aequalicauda* by Stuart Baker, *Fauna British India, Birds*, vol. 7, p. 138) for a bird from Kunawár, Kachhar, which represents this same species. Although I have not had an opportunity to examine the type specimen, there can be no doubt from the original description (which was kindly copied for me by Dr G.F. Mees of Leiden) that Blyth's name applies to the *Muscicapa ruficauda* of authors. I therefore cannot see any reason for suppressing Blyth's name *aequalicauda*, and *Muscicapa ruficauda* auctt. therefore should stand as *Muscicapa* (or *Ficedula*) *aequalicauda* (Blyth, 1851). On the other hand, in order to avoid confusion, the binomen *Muscicapa ruficauda* Swainson, 1838, may be suppressed in favour of *Cyornis unicolor* Blyth, 1843, as proposed by Mr Benson.

(2) Reply by C.W. Benson

I agree with Dr Wolters that Blyth's name *aequalicauda* would appear to apply to the taxon *ruficauda* in the sense of Sharpe, 1879 rather than of Swainson, 1838, in view of 'whitish' under tail-coverts and 'Bill dark above, whitish below' (reference *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 181-182, 1979, paragraph 6). I am unaware, however, that Blyth's name has ever been used subsequently to 1851 beyond the single citation by E.C.S. Baker referred to